

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**LAURA WICKIZER,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**DR. CATHERINE E. CRIM**, Personally,  
**DR. S. SHELTON**, Personally, **D. BROWN**,  
Personally,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:18-cv-01816-AC

**ORDER**

**IMMERGUT, District Judge.**

On February 2, 2022, Magistrate Judge John V. Acosta issued his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”). ECF 124. The F&R recommends that this Court grant Defendants’ motion for summary judgment, ECF 104, and dismiss this action with prejudice. No party filed objections. For the following reasons, the Court ADOPTS Judge Acosta’s F&R.

**STANDARDS**

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), as amended, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.”

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s F&R, “the court shall make a de

novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, *sua sponte*” whether de novo or under another standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154.

### **CONCLUSION**

No party having filed objections, this Court has reviewed the F&R and accepts Judge Acosta’s conclusions. The F&R, ECF 124, is adopted in full. Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF 104, is GRANTED, and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 23rd day of February, 2022.

/s/ Karin J. Immergut  
Karin J. Immergut  
United States District Judge